Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 30, 2007. The fee for addition of new claims is included herewith.

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Claims 1-8 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Oberle et al., "Developing and Managing Software Components in an Ontology-Based Application Server," Middleware 2004, pp. 459-477.

II.   Summary of Applicant's Response

The present Reply cancels claims 2-8, amends claim 1, adds new claims 9-37, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1 and 9-37. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

III.   Response to Rejections

Claim 1 was amended to better describe embodiments of the invention. Claim 1 states (as amended):

> A method for generating a custom MBean, comprising:
>   receiving an MBean definition file in XML format;
>   generating an MBean jar file from the MBean definition file, wherein the MBean jar file includes a tag for the MBean and a tag for each attribute, operation, and potential notification issued by the MBean; and
>   placing the jar file in a predetermined directory within a managed server in a management domain.

Claim 1 describes a method for generating a custom MBean, including generating an MBean

- 8 -

jar file which includes a tag for the MBean and a tag for each attribute, operation, and potential notification issued by the MBean.

Oberle describes developing and managing software components in an ontology-based application server, specifically the Karlsruhe Ontology and Semantic Web Tool suite (KAON). While Oberle does discuss MBeans, Oberle does not disclose MBean jar files that include a tag for the MBean and a tag for each attribute, operation, and potential notification issued by the MBean.

Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Oberle. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn. Dependent Claims 9-37 depend from Claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above with regards to Claim 1, dependent Claims 9-37 are also patentable.

IV.   Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __April 27, 2007__   By:____/Thomas K. Plunkett/_____

Thomas K. Plunkett
Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800